## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

## **NOTICE OF DOCUMENT DISCREPANCIES**

FILED

	,	2007 DEC 20 PH 4: 46
TO: U. S. DISTRICT JUDGE / U. S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE GLERN US TO ALLEGE DE NIA		
FR	OM: <u>R. Mul</u>	lin, Deputy Clerk RECEIVED DATE: 12/18/2007
CA	SE NO.: <u>0</u>	7cv2282 DMS (BLM) DOCUMENT FILED BY: BY Plaintiff Y DEPUTY
CASE TITLE: Montoya et al v. Ramirez		
DOCUMENT ENTITLED: Motion to Appeal and Reverse Order for Transfer of Venue		
Upon the submission of the attached document(s), the following discrepancies are noted:		
1	Local Rule	Discrepancy
X	5.1	Missing time and date on motion and/or supporting documentation
	5.3	Document illegible or submitted on thermal facsimile paper
	5.4	Document not filed electronically. Notice of Noncompliance already issued.
	7.1 or 47.1	Date noticed for hearing not in compliance with rules/Document(s) are not timely
X	7.1 or 47.1	Lacking memorandum of points and authorities in support as a separate document
	7.1 or 47.1	Briefs or memoranda exceed length restrictions
	7.1	Missing table of contents
	15.1	Amended pleading not complete in itself
	30.1	Depositions not accepted absent a court order
		Supplemental documents require court order
		Default Judgment in sum certain includes calculated interest
		OTHER:
		<b>Date forwarded:</b> <u>12/19/2007</u>
ORDER OF THE JUDGE / MAGISTRATE JUDGE IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:		
X	The document is to be filed nunc pro tunc to date received.	
$\Box$	,	
	The document is NOT to be filed, but instead REJECTED. and it is ORDERED that the Clerk serve a copy of this order on all parties.	
	Rejected do	ocument to be returned to pro se or inmate?  Yes. Court Copy retained by chambers
	Counsel is to Local Ru	advised that any further failure to comply with the Local Rules may lead to penalties pursuant ale 83.1  CHAMBERS OF: Judge Sabraw  (M. 1.05.
	Dated:	By: 43CC